United Nations S/PV.6897 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-seventh year

Provisional

6897th meeting

Thursday, 20 December 2012, 3.45 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Loulichki/Mr. Bouchaara	(Morocco)
Members:	Azerbaijan	Mr. Musayev
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	Colombia	Mr. Osorio
	France	Mr. Briens
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	Guatemala	Mr. Rosenthal
	India	Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri
	Pakistan	Mr. Tarar
	Portugal	Mr. Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Mr. Laher
	Togo	Mr. Menan
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mrs. DiCarlo

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

12-66022 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.45 p.m.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes, in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

I give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Nkoloi (Botswana): First, we thank the Secretary-General for his report (S/2012/746) and for his statement this morning.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered earlier on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement under this agenda item.

Botswana attaches great importance to the promotion of post-conflict peacebuilding, and we welcome your initiative, Sir, to hold this Security Council open debate on the subject.

As a small, peace-loving country that once ranked among the poorest in the world, Botswana was once described by political commentators as an impoverished, arid and hungry land without any hope of achieving economic stability. In 1966, one commentator — a Canadian journalist — made that observation, as he could not foresee a bright future for post-independence Botswana, which had no infrastructure, no institutions and no human capital. He was convinced that we were destined to remain an international charity case forever. Little did he see that we were an optimistic nation that believed that our history was not our destiny.

In that spirit, we believe that countries emerging from conflict can regain their dignity by investing in instruments of peace, capacity-building and inclusive governance and strong institutions. My delegation therefore wishes to underline the importance of supporting the democratization process and institutional development as crucial measures for the prevention of conflict and for laying the foundation for sustainable economic and social development.

In that regard, addressing the needs and challenges of vulnerable groups such as the youth, children, women, the disabled and the injured should be an integral part of effective peacebuilding. That is significant in great part because those groups of victims usually play little role, or no role at all, in the incitement, planning and execution of violent conflict, but are always the ones who suffer most.

Resources should be committed to the demilitarization, disarmament and reintegration of ex-combatants through building an environment of trust and security premised on economic, political and social assimilation.

As we seek to build peace and promote sustainable development in post-conflict countries, we should not ignore the contribution of women to the prevention and resolution of conflict and to peacebuilding. Botswana therefore supports the inclusion of women and their expanded role in decision-making and peacekeeping processes. We believe that sustainable development and democracy cannot be richer if we marginalize women.

Civil society and the media are two other very important constituencies in post-conflict peacebuilding. They are the ones who know the dynamics and needs of the people. Their participation can help form and shape public policy, especially with regard to human rights issues.

The common sentiment is that peace, safety and stability are prerequisites for the achievement of sustainable development. The causes of conflict, particularly in Africa, include the absence of institutions, weak governance structures, disregard for the rule of law and the inequitable distribution of resources. Botswana therefore wishes to collaborate with the international community at the bilateral, regional and international levels to achieve long-term peace, stability and development in countries that are emerging from conflict. With its traditions rooted in accountable and transparent governance, democracy and judicious investment in resources, Botswana has pledged through CAPMATCH to share its experiences and practices with post-conflict countries in the areas of civilian capacity, good governance, economic management, the rule of law and public administration.

Finally, Botswana supports presidential statement S/PRST/2012/29, adopted earlier in this open debate.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Müftüoğlu (Turkey): I would like to thank and commend the presidency of Morocco for organizing this open debate on this important issue. Let me also thank the Secretary-General and Ambassador Abulkalam Abdul Momen for their substantive briefings.

The Secretary General's report entitled "Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict"

(S/2012/746), in referring to the World Bank's *World Development Report 2011*, underscores a key finding, namely, that 90 per cent of conflicts between 2000 and 2009 occurred in countries that had previously experienced civil war. That highlights the importance of succeeding in peacebuilding endeavours and the cost of failure. We must ensure that our efforts have reached their long-term objectives if we do not want to have to duplicate effort and waste precious human and financial resources in the future. Fortunately, today we have a better understanding, experience and capacity in post-conflict peacebuilding. At the same time, we need to achieve further progress, as rightfully reflected in the Secretary General's report.

Above all, it should never be forgotten that each country is unique. Local conditions, needs, opportunities and limitations may differ considerably. That means that the prioritization of peacebuilding and capacity-building activities must be country-specific. The strategic planning of peacebuilding activities should therefore also be sufficiently flexible. Peacebuilding is primarily a national responsibility. As stressed by the Secretary-General and many delegations, therefore, national ownership is of critical importance. The effective and sustainable realization of peacebuilding goals requires the active engagement of all local stakeholders, including civil society, women, young people and the elderly. Furthermore, one of the priorities in peacebuilding efforts should be to win the hearts and minds of the local people and to work together with them. That would increase the success of such endeavours. In its absence, as mentioned by the Secretary-General in his report, when pursued without national ownership, or prematurely by authorities that lack legitimacy, reforms can prove detrimental.

Turkey also attaches importance to the implementation of the seven-point action plan for gender-responsive peacebuilding. We welcome the progress achieved in some of its goals and look forward to advances in all of them. In that context, Turkey, together with Finland and the Friends of Mediation, is actively engaged in promoting women's participation in conflict resolution and peace processes. Additionally, we believe that the Security Council should give greater attention to gender-related considerations when discussing the mandates of operations aimed at assisting political processes and peace efforts.

On the other hand, we welcome the Secretary-General's call to further engage foundations and the private sector. Initiatives that seek to promote their engagement, such as the Istanbul International Centre for Private Sector in Development of the United Nations Development Programme, should be given due support.

Institution-building is a key activity in peacebuilding. However, as stated by the Secretary-General, it is important to build on existing institutions and to allow those institutions to develop at their own pace and in their own direction. In that context, we also firmly agree with the Secretary-General that international assistance should be tailored with a sound understanding of local circumstances. Furthermore, we believe that in capacity-building, South-South and triangular cooperation are important. Turkey therefore supports and sees added value in the civilian capacities initiative.

In order for our peacebuilding endeavours to succeed, we should pursue an integrated and comprehensive approach, which should be based on coherence among political, security, development, human rights, humanitarian and rule-of-law objectives. We believe that it is necessary to take complementary actions in all those areas. In addition, it is essential for peacebuilding efforts to include a regional dimension to the extent possible. The involvement of regional stakeholders will increase the chances of success and the sustainability of peacebuilding efforts even after the attention of the international community diminishes.

In view of the resource constraints we face, our ability to coordinate the activities of different actors in a strategic and effective manner has gained even more importance. In that regard, the United Nations has a unique role to play. The United Nations, with all its entities, including the three pillars of its peacebuilding architecture — the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Offices — that are central to peacebuilding efforts, is best placed to coordinate the work of various stakeholders to deliver as one on the ground. We therefore welcome and support any steps that aim to strengthen that role, including the streamlining of coordination and coherence within the United Nations system.

Before concluding, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Germany, Guatemala, Colombia, India, Portugal and South Africa for their important contributions to the work of the Security Council during the past two years. We welcome the incoming members and wish them every success.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Ms. Morch Smith (Norway): Norway would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report (S/2012/746). We will focus on two issues that we see as central, namely, the need for inclusive political settlements and international support for peacebuilding.

One year ago, the Nobel Peace Prize winner for 2011, Tawakkol Karman of Yemen, gave her Nobel lecture in Oslo. She stated:

> "I have always believed that human civilization is the fruit of the effort of both women and men. So, when women are treated unjustly and are deprived of their natural right in this process, all social deficiencies and cultural illnesses will be unfolded, and in the end the whole community, men and women, will suffer".

Violent conflicts are not solved or settled in a just and sustainable manner if women have not been part of the process. Resolution 1325 (2000) was a landmark resolution. There is growing awareness of the role of women in peacebuilding. As stated in the report before us, there has been uneven progress in the implementation of the seven-point action plan for gender-responsive peacebuilding. There is an urgent need to see genuine and concrete results at the field level. Studies, reports and workshops are fine, but they cannot buy political will to make a real difference for women in peacebuilding. We must now act on the plentiful knowledge we have and we must implement inclusive peacebuilding.

There can be no doubt that political and economic exclusion, inequalities and discrimination undermine sustainable peace. We must all ask ourselves how we can foster inclusive political settlement and conflict resolution that will lead to sustained peace. Peacebuilding is a difficult process that takes time and involves many risks. We must be patient, but patience does not mean inaction. And sometimes the international community must be willing to take risks. Donors must move from risk aversion to risk management.

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has proven its comparative advantages. The Fund's focus on countries low on the radar, its swiftness, its willingness to take risks and its large donor base constitute the Fund's main strengths and added value. But we must remember that PBF is most of all a catalytic fund. The Peacebuilding Fund cannot be the main funding source of a peacebuilding process in a country.

Sustained and predictable financing for peacebuilding is important and Norway will continue to provide substantial funding. But let us be clear. In peacebuilding, broad national ownership is of vital importance; good political leadership is essential; accountability is key. In her Nobel lecture last year, President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf of Liberia summarized it the following way:

> "Liberia's continued progress depends on policies and programs that invest in people and strengthen democratic institutions, while remaining grounded in the rule of law. Most importantly, they must stand the test of time. They must not be dependent on any one leader or any one political party. We must build space and respect for opposition voices; they are not the losers in our open society, but an essential component to strengthened accountability in government."

The real test of peacebuilding is to ensure that such wise words are followed up in countries undergoing a transformation from internal conflict to lasting peace. The international community must provide political and financial support, but the primary responsibility lies with the countries concerned.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I now give the floor to the Netherlands.

Mr. Schaper (Netherlands): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on peacebuilding. The Netherlands aligns itself with the statement made by the observer of the European Union.

I want to begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his important report (S/2012/746), which shows that major progress has been made on peacebuilding since the Secretary-General's first report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict was issued in 2009 (S/2009/304). To cite some important examples, peacebuilding and State-building are now a high priority for post-conflict countries themselves, as shown by the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. That initiative is, in our view, a crucial milestone and a clear expression of the national ownership and commitment of fragile States themselves. The determination to leave conflict behind should be clearly recognized and supported by the United Nations. I am therefore pleased that the Secretary-General embraces that initiative in his report.

We also have made progress in the integration of peacebuilding in both security and development. Let me mention in particular the High-level Meeting on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels (A/67/PV.3), which emphasized the importance of the rule of law as one of the key elements of conflict prevention, peacekeeping, conflict resolution and peacebuilding. It also stressed that justice, including transitional justice, is a fundamental building block of sustainable peace in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations.

Also, substantially more funding for peacebuilding is available through the Peacebuilding Fund, as well as through other multilateral and bilateral funding mechanisms. Furthermore, cooperation with regional organizations and international financial institutions has been strengthened. The *World Development Report 2011* is an excellent example of that cooperation with the international financial institutions and now provides a joint analytical underpinning for our collective work on peacebuilding. Overall, therefore, we are in a much better position now than we were collectively in 2009.

But the recent report of the Secretary-General also makes clear that many challenges still exist and we agree with that. I would like to highlight three issues from the point of view of the Netherlands.

First, we recognize that the response of the United Nations family has improved and that many institutional changes have been implemented, especially at Headquarters. Interagency task forces for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and security sector reform have been established. A joint global focal point for police, justice and corrections has been created. The United Nations is improving its civilian capacities in the aftermath of conflict. Integrated mission planning processes and integrated strategic frameworks have strengthened cooperation within the United Nations system, and peace and development advisers are increasingly being deployed.

Those are important steps, indeed, but the key question that we still need to answer is whether those changes have had a substantial positive impact on the ground. Have they not only resulted in better coordination and cooperation at the country level through more joint analysis, joint planning and programming, and joint implementation, but have they also achieved better and quicker results on the ground in line with the priorities of national Governments in post-conflict situations?

The feedback we receive from our embassies indicates that progress is mixed. Substantial improvements remain necessary, especially at the country level and also in non-mission settings. Speeding up delivering as one, overcoming internal divisions within the United Nations system, and further increasing coordination, cooperation and alignment are essential steps in that regard. Both the Secretary-General and the membership could improve the results on the ground by providing the necessary incentives, as far as the membership is concerned, including through donor funding. The Security Council could also support those efforts by providing guidance and deepening its discussions on the implementation of peacebuilding mandates in missions. The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) could play a useful advisory role in that regard.

Secondly, we welcome the focus of the Secretary-General on three priority peacebuilding directions: inclusivity, institution-building and sustained international support combined with mutual accountability. We encourage the Secretary-General to build on lessons learned on these issues and to provide good practices which can be implemented by the United Nations system. In doing so, we should not overlook the importance of employment — of jobs — through engagement with the private sector and of the delivery of basic services, such as health and education, in post-conflict settings. A stronger economic position for women and young people should be part of those efforts. I am pleased that the role of women in promoting peace and security features high on the agenda of the Secretary-General. He has our full support in his ambition to reach the goals in the seven-point plan for gender-responsive peacebuilding.

A last issue is consistency in the positions taken by the United Nations Members themselves with regard to peacebuilding. We hope that today's debate will have a positive impact, as the membership, in our view, operates too much in silos as well. That is the kind of criticism we have heard of the Secretariat and the United Nations family.

The high-level event on peacebuilding organized in September by the Chairperson of the PBC, Bangladesh, recognized the critical importance of peacebuilding in strengthening peace in post-conflict countries, preventing their relapse into conflict, and achieving long-term sustainable peace through security and development. However, any discussion of the relationship between peacebuilding and development

in the context of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review was dismissed by some member States as irrelevant, notwithstanding the conclusions drawn from the meeting in September; the progress on enhancing civilian capacities through the civilian capacity review is extremely slow, even though it addresses clear peacebuilding challenges; and embracing the clearest example of national ownership, the Group of Seven Plus initiative, has met with tremendous resistance, I am sorry to say.

If we collectively commit ourselves to peacebuilding in debates such as today's, we also need to make progress in those related discussions with other bodies of the United Nations. Only in this way can we ensure that the whole United Nations system contributes to this important cause.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I should like to express on this occasion the sincere appreciation of the delegation of Morocco to the members of the Council, especially to my colleagues the Permanent Representatives, their respective staff and the Council secretariat, for all the support they have given us during our presidency this month. Indeed, it has been a busy month and one in which we rallied to consensus on several important issues within our purview. We could not have done it alone. Nor could we have done it without the hard work, tireless support and positive contributions of every delegation, the representatives of the Secretariat and the interpreters, translators, meeting services staff and sound engineers.

As we end our presidency, I know I speak on behalf of the Council when I wish the delegation of Pakistan good luck in the month of January 2013.

As today's meeting may be — I repeat, may be — the last public meeting of the Security Council in December 2012, I should like, in my capacity as President and on behalf of the Council, to express the sincere appreciation of the Council to the five outgoing members: Colombia, Germany, India, Portugal and South Africa. I commend them for their relentless hard work and valuable contributions during their 2011-2012 term on the Security Council. I would also like to say to those five delegations that the Moroccan delegation was profoundly happy to have shared the year 2012 with them.

At the same time, I welcome the new members of the Council — Argentina, Australia, Luxembourg, the Republic of Korea and Rwanda — wish each of them a very successful mandate, God willing.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.